

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the issues raised in the above-referenced Office Action is respectfully solicited.

Applicants appreciate the telephone interview of August 21, 2003 regarding this application. In the interview, the Information Disclosure Statement filed July 21, 2003 was discussed. Patent Application Serial No. 10/043 571 ('571 application) provided therewith has common inventorship and a common Assignee. The '571 application was not considered. However, application '571 was filed on January 10, 2002, which is after the priority date of this application.

During the interview, the output device 21 being a separate conveyor was discussed. This feature is not present in the applied prior art.

U.S. Patent No. 3 888 164 to Taddei was also discussed during the telephone conference. Taddei teaches commonly driven parallel conveyors 10 and 11 with diagonally opposing lugs 19 and 20 moving at a similar velocity. Applicants' claimed invention does include a pair of rotating devices 28 and 29 similar to the conveyors 10 and 11 of Taddei. Applicants' invention, however, also claims the output device that corresponds to output device 21 illustrated in Applicants' drawing figure. The output device 21 acts as a conveyor having angled lugs for advancing partially unfolded box sleeves.

As discussed during the telephone interview, the prior art does not disclose or suggest "an output device for removing the only partially unfolded box sleeves from the removing device and advancing the partially unfolded box sleeves from the chute", much less in combination with "first and second rotating devices for receiving the only partially unfolded box sleeves" as recited in Claim 9.

Taddei only discloses first and second rotating devices 10, 11 acting as conveyors to move the unfolded boxes for processing. Further, Roberto and Dietrich do not disclose the claimed combination.

Applicants' Claim 1 recites "an output device for removing the partially unfolded-box sleeves from the chute" and "first and second devices provided at the expansion chamber and operated at the same speed to hold the fully unfolded box sleeves at diagonally opposite edges and to forward the fully unfolded box sleeves". As discussed above, Taddei discloses first and second conveyors 10, 11 operated at the same speed to forward the fully unfolded box sleeves. Roberto, Dietrich and Taddei individually, or in combination, do not disclose the first and second rotating devices, in combination with the output device for removing the sleeves from the chute.

For the above reasons, independent Claims 1 and 9, and claims dependent therefrom, are allowable over the applied prior art.

Amended Claim 11 recites "advancing the partially unfolded box sleeve from the chute without further significant unfolding into an expansion chamber following the chute using the output device" and "fully unfolding the partially unfolded box sleeve in the expansion chamber utilizing first and second rotating devices". As discussed above, the applied prior art does not disclose the combination of physical elements (output device, rotating devices) needed to perform the claimed method steps.

In accordance with 37 CFR §1.133(b), the above comments include the substance of the August 21, 2003 interview.

Dependent Claim 2 is rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over Roberto in view of Dietrich and further in view of Gutinger. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 2 is allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to independent Claim 1. Further, Taddei is not applied to reject Claim 2. Therefore, there is no teaching of "first and second devices provided at the expansion chamber" as recited in parent Claim 1.

Claim 2 recites that "the removing device includes several arms having suction heads, and the arms are movable by

a drive and a planetary gearing along a cycloidal path". Taddei and Dietrich do not disclose moving several arms along a cycloidal path. Further, there is no motivation to substitute the rotary object feeder having a cycloidal path of Gutinger for the withdrawing device of Roberto, which moves the partially unfolded boxes along a path against a striker 53 or Dietrich which moves the boxes along a path including a locally fixed rail 5. The device of Roberto would not function properly if the unfolded box sleeves were moved along a cycloidal path.

Added Claim 14 depends from, and is allowable for the reasons set forth above with respect to Claim 9. Claim 14 merely emphasizes features from the arrangement already recited in Claim 2. Therefore, Claim 14 presents no new issues requiring further consideration.

For the above reasons, allowance of Claims 1-5 and 9-14 is respectfully requested.

Further and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Brian R. Tumm

BRT/ad

FLYNN, THIEL, BOUTELL	Dale H. Thiel	Reg. No. 24 323
& TANIS, P.C.	David G. Boutell	Reg. No. 25 072
2026 Rambling Road	Ronald J. Tanis	Reg. No. 22 724
Kalamazoo, MI 49008-1631	Terryence F. Chapman	Reg. No. 32 549
Phone: (269) 381-1156	Mark L. Maki	Reg. No. 36 589
Fax: (269) 381-5465	David S. Goldenberg	Reg. No. 31 257
	Sidney B. Williams, Jr.	Reg. No. 24 949
	Liane L. Churney	Reg. No. 40 694
	Brian R. Tumm	Reg. No. 36 328
	Robert J. Sayfie	Reg. No. 37 714

Encl: Postal Card

136.0703